

On the Additivity of the Entanglement of Formation

Fabio Benatti¹, Heide Narnhofer²

¹ *Dep. Theor. Phys., University di Trieste, Strada Costiera 11, I-34100, Trieste, Italy*

² *Inst. Theor. Phys., University of Vienna, Boltzmannngasse 5, A-1090, Wien, Austria*

We study whether the entanglement of formation is additive over tensor products and derive a necessary and sufficient condition for optimality of vector states that enables us to show additivity in two special cases.

PACS: 03.67.-a

Entanglement plays a crucial role in teleportation and quantum cryptography and is currently the focus of investigations in the developing field of quantum information [1]–[6]. Quantifying entanglement in a satisfactory way is a major issue in quantum information; there is a list of minimal desiderata and the available proposals have been proved to comply with all of them but for additivity for which only numerical support exists [3].

In this letter we are concerned with the entanglement of formation, defined by [1]

$$E_f(\rho; M_1) = \min \left\{ \sum_{i \in I} p_i S(\sigma_i|_{M_1}) \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where ρ is a generic mixed state on the tensor product of two full matrix algebras $M_1 \otimes M_2$, the minimum is computed over all decompositions $\rho = \sum_{i \in I} p_i \sigma_i$ of ρ into pure states σ_i on $M_1 \otimes M_2$ and $S(\sigma_i|_{M_1})$ is the von Neumann entropy of the restriction of σ_i onto M_1 .

The question we want to address is whether

$$E_f(\rho \otimes \rho; M_1 \otimes M_1) = 2 E_f(\rho; M_1), \quad (2)$$

where $M_1 \otimes M_1$ is short for $M_1 \otimes 1_2 \otimes M_1 \otimes 1_2$.

Additivity or its failure will have a quantum information theoretic counterpart; there is indeed a connection between (1) and the maximal accessible information $I(\rho)$ of a quantum source described by a mixed state ρ on a matrix algebra M [6]–[8]. If $\rho = \sum_{\ell \in L} q_\ell \rho_\ell$, then $I(\rho) := \sup_B I_B(\rho)$, where

$$I_B(\rho) = - \sum_{i \in I} (\text{Tr}(\rho b_i)) \log(\text{Tr}(\rho b_i)) + \sum_{\ell \in L} q_\ell \sum_{i \in I} (\text{Tr}(\rho_\ell b_i)) \log(\text{Tr}(\rho_\ell b_i)), \quad (3)$$

the maximum being computed over all choices $B = \{b_i\}$ of positive $b_i \in M$ such that $\sum_{i \in I} b_i = 1_M$. Optimal choices correspond to optimal detection of the classical information carried by the quantum states ρ_ℓ .

Since $q_\ell \rho_\ell \leq \rho$ there exists a unique choice of operators $0 < a_\ell \in M$, $\ell \in L$, with $\sum_{\ell \in L} a_\ell = 1$, such that

$$q_\ell \rho_\ell = \sqrt{\rho} a_\ell \sqrt{\rho}, \quad q_\ell = \text{Tr}(\rho a_\ell). \quad (4)$$

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a commutative L dimensional algebra with identity $1_{\mathcal{A}}$ and orthogonal projectors A_ℓ with $\sum_\ell A_\ell = 1_{\mathcal{A}}$.

The map $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \mapsto M$ obtained by linear extension of $A_\ell \mapsto \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(A_\ell) = a_\ell$ is positive and $\gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(1_{\mathcal{A}}) = 1_M$. Therefore, given any state σ on M , the linear functional $\sigma \circ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathbb{C}$, $\sigma \circ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}(A_\ell) = \text{Tr}(\sigma a_\ell)$ defines a state on $\mathcal{A}$. Using (4) and the cyclicity of the trace,

$$\text{Tr}(\rho_\ell b_i) = \frac{\text{Tr}(\rho b_i)}{\text{Tr}(\rho a_\ell)} \text{Tr}(\sigma_i^B a_\ell), \quad \sigma_i^B := \frac{\sqrt{\rho} b_i \sqrt{\rho}}{\text{Tr}(\rho b_i)}. \quad (5)$$

Setting $p_i^B = \text{Tr}(\rho b_i)$, (3) becomes

$$I_B(\rho) = S(\rho \circ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}) - \sum_{i \in I} p_i^B S(\sigma_i^B \circ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}). \quad (6)$$

Therefore, $I(\rho)$ is the maximum of (6) over all possible decompositions of ρ into pure states:

$$I(\rho) = S(\rho \circ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}) - \min_{\rho = \sum_i p_i \sigma_i} \sum_i p_i S(\sigma_i \circ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}). \quad (7)$$

If N is a subalgebra of M , substituting the restrictions $\rho|_N$, $\sigma_i|_N$ for $\rho \circ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$, respectively $\sigma_i \circ \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$, we obtain the so-called *entropy of a subalgebra* [9]

$$H_\rho(N) := S(\rho|_N) - \min_{\rho = \sum_i p_i \sigma_i} \sum_i p_i S(\sigma_i|_N). \quad (8)$$

The latter quantity is the building block of an extension of the Kolmogorov-Sinai dynamical entropy (or entropy per unit time) to the quantum realm. According to the above $E_f(\rho; M_1) = S(\rho|_{M_1}) - H_\rho(M_1)$.

As the von Neumann entropy is additive over tensor products, if additivity fails for the entanglement of formation, it also fails for the entropy of a subalgebra. Then, from an information-theoretic point of view, we would deem possible to extract more information about the tensor product of two states over two independent subalgebras than that obtainable from the two of them independently [10,11].

In the following we try to use some of the properties of $H_\rho(N)$ to investigate the general question whether

$$E_f(\rho \otimes \sigma; M_1 \otimes M_3) = E_f(\rho; M_1) + E_f(\sigma; M_3), \quad (9)$$

where ρ and σ are states on the (finite dimensional) algebras $M_1 \otimes M_2$, respectively $M_3 \otimes M_4$.

If $E_f(\rho; M_1)$ and $E_f(\sigma; M_3)$ are achieved at optimal decompositions $\rho = \sum_\ell p_\ell \rho_\ell$ and $\sigma = \sum_j q_j \sigma_j$, the factorized decomposition $\rho \otimes \sigma = \sum_{j,\ell} q_j p_\ell \rho_\ell \otimes \sigma_j$ contribute

to $E_f(\rho \otimes \sigma; M_1 \otimes M_3)$ with $E_f(\rho_1; M_1) + E_f(\sigma; M_3)$. However, the latter need not be optimal and the strict inequality $E_f(\rho \otimes \sigma; M_1 \otimes M_3) < E_f(\rho_1; M_1) + E_f(\sigma; M_3)$ is not excluded. In fact, a decomposition

$$\rho \otimes \sigma = \sum_i \alpha_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|, \quad \alpha_i > 0, \quad \sum_i \alpha_i = 1, \quad (10)$$

might be optimal with the ψ_i entangled states over $M_1 \otimes M_3$. Let us consider the Schmidt decomposition

$$|\psi_i\rangle = \sum_j \beta_{ij} |\phi_{ij}^{12}\rangle \otimes |\phi_{ij}^{34}\rangle, \quad \|\psi_i\| = 1, \quad \beta_{ij} > 0, \quad (11)$$

where, for fixed i the $|\phi_{ij}^{12}\rangle$'s and $|\phi_{ij}^{34}\rangle$'s form orthonormal bases over $M_1 \otimes M_2$, respectively $M_3 \otimes M_4$. If it held that

$$S(|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|_{M_1 \otimes M_3}) \geq \sum_j \beta_{ij}^2 \left(S(|\phi_{ij}^{12}\rangle\langle\phi_{ij}^{12}|_{M_1}) + S(|\phi_{ij}^{34}\rangle\langle\phi_{ij}^{34}|_{M_3}) \right) \quad (12)$$

additivity would follow because tensor-product states would then never be worse than correlated ones.

Proving the sufficient condition (12) has so far escaped us; there are however particular cases where one can show additivity by using two results obtained for the entropy of a subalgebra (8). Both results concern general properties of optimal decompositions for $H_\rho(N)$ that we adapt to the entanglement of formation [12,13].

Proposition 1. If ρ is a state on $M_1 \otimes M_2$, $E_f(\rho; M_1)$ is achieved at $\rho = \sum_\ell p_\ell \rho_\ell$ and U is a unitary operator on $M_1 \otimes M_2$, then $E_f(U^\dagger \rho U; M_1)$ is achieved at the optimal decomposition $U^\dagger \rho U = \sum_\ell p_\ell U^\dagger \rho_\ell U$.

Proposition 2. Let ρ be a state on $M_1 \otimes M_2$ and $E_f(\rho; M_1)$ be achieved at $\rho = \sum_\ell p_\ell \rho_\ell$. That is, $E_f(\rho; M_1) = \sum_\ell p_\ell S(\rho_\ell|_{M_1})$, then

$$E_f(\sigma; M_1) = \sum_j q_j S(\rho_j|_{M_1}), \quad (13)$$

where $\sigma = \sum_j q_j \rho_j$ is any linear convex combination of optimal states of ρ .

To the above, we add a new property. With some abuse of notation, we denote by $E_f(\rho; N)$ the minimum in (8), even if there is no tensor product structure in N .

Proposition 3. Let $|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$, $i = 1, 2$, contribute to $E_f(\rho; N)$ and denote

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i &:= |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|_N, \quad i = 1, 2; \quad \sigma_{12} := |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_2|_N \\ \sigma_{ov}(\gamma) &:= \gamma \sigma_{21} + \gamma^* \sigma_{12} \\ \sigma(\gamma) &:= |\gamma|^2 \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 - \sigma_{ov}(\gamma), \quad \hat{\sigma}(\gamma) := \frac{\sigma(\gamma)}{\text{Tr}(\sigma(\gamma))}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for all complex γ ,

$$\frac{|\gamma|^2 S(\sigma_1) + S(\sigma_2) + \text{Tr}(\sigma_{ov}(\gamma) \log \sigma_1)}{\text{Tr}(\sigma(\gamma))} \leq S(\hat{\sigma}(\gamma)). \quad (14)$$

Vice versa, if inequality (14) holds for all complex γ , then for all $\rho_\lambda = \lambda |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + (1 - \lambda) |\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|$, $1 \geq \lambda \geq 0$, one gets $E_f(\rho_\lambda; N) = \lambda S(\sigma_1) + (1 - \lambda) S(\sigma_2)$.

Proof of Necessity: Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and set

$$\rho_{\varepsilon, \gamma} = (1 + \varepsilon |\gamma|^2) |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + \varepsilon (1 + \varepsilon |\gamma|^2) |\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|$$

be a not normalized state on M . As ψ_i , $i = 1, 2$ are optimal, Proposition 2 yields

$$E_f(\rho_{\varepsilon, \gamma}; N) = (1 + \varepsilon |\gamma|^2) S(\sigma_1) + \varepsilon (1 + \varepsilon |\gamma|^2) S(\sigma_2).$$

Indeed, in taking the minimum in (8) normalization is not necessary. With $|\phi_1\rangle := |\psi_1\rangle + \varepsilon \gamma |\psi_2\rangle$ and $|\phi_2\rangle := |\psi_1\rangle - (\gamma^*)^{-1} |\psi_2\rangle$, we construct a new decomposition $\rho_{\varepsilon, \gamma} = |\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1| + \varepsilon |\gamma|^2 |\phi_2\rangle\langle\phi_2|$.

The latter cannot contribute more than $E_f(\rho_{\varepsilon, \gamma}; N)$; therefore, $E_f(\rho_{\varepsilon, \gamma}; N) \leq f(\varepsilon)$, where

$$f(\varepsilon) := \|\phi_1\|^2 S(|\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1|_N) + \varepsilon |\gamma|^2 \|\phi_2\|^2 S(|\phi_2\rangle\langle\phi_2|_N).$$

Inequality (14) must then hold at first order in ε .

Proof of Sufficiency: By assumption, inequality (14) holds for all γ 's. Thus, choosing $\alpha_i \geq 0$ and γ_i such that $\sum_i \alpha_i |\gamma_i|^2 = \lambda$, $\sum_i \alpha_i = 1 - \lambda$ and $\sum_i \alpha_i \gamma_i = 0$, we get

$$\lambda S(\sigma_1) + (1 - \lambda) S(\sigma_2) \leq \sum_i \alpha_i \left(\text{Tr} \sigma(\gamma_i) \right) S(\hat{\sigma}(\gamma_i)).$$

In the above, the left hand side is the contribution to $E_f(\rho_\lambda; N)$ of $\rho_\lambda = \lambda |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + (1 - \lambda) |\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|$, whereas the right hand side is the contribution of

$$\rho_\lambda = \sum_i \alpha_i |\psi_1 + \gamma_i \psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_1 + \gamma_i \psi_2|. \quad (15)$$

The latter are the most general decompositions of ρ_λ ; in fact, ρ_λ as an operator acts on the two-dimensional subspace spanned by the linearly independent vectors ψ_i , $i = 1, 2$. Hence, the result follows.

With the help of Propositions 1, 2 and 3 we can now prove additivity in some special cases.

Case 1: In (11) the state σ factorizes over $M_3 \otimes M_4$: $\sigma = \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_4$.

Let $E_f(\rho \otimes \sigma; M_1 \otimes M_3)$ be achieved at an optimal decomposition made of states $|\psi_i\rangle$ entangled over $M_1 \otimes M_3$. Let us consider the Schmidt decompositions $|\psi_i\rangle = \sum_j c_{ij} |\phi_{ij}^{13}\rangle \otimes |\phi_{ij}^{24}\rangle$ with $c_{ij} \geq 0$ and $|\phi_{ij}^{13}\rangle$ and $|\phi_{ij}^{24}\rangle$ forming, for each fixed i , orthonormal bases in the first and third factor, respectively. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho \otimes \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_4 &= \sum_i \alpha_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \\ &= \sum_{ijk} \alpha_i c_{ij} c_{ik} |\phi_{ij}^{13}\rangle\langle\phi_{ik}^{13}| \otimes |\phi_{ij}^{24}\rangle\langle\phi_{ik}^{24}|. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Further, let $|\chi_\ell^3\rangle$ be eigenvectors of σ_3 and consider the unitary operator ($\in M_3$)

$$\hat{U}_\ell = 1 - (1 - i)P_\ell, \quad P_\ell := |\chi_\ell^3\rangle\langle\chi_\ell^3|.$$

From Proposition 1 it follows that the vectors $U_\ell|\psi_i\rangle$, $U_\ell = 1_1 \otimes 1_2 \otimes \hat{U}_\ell \otimes 1_4$, also give $E_f(\rho \otimes \sigma; M_1 \otimes M_3)$. Let us concentrate on $|\psi_1\rangle$; together with $U_\ell|\psi_1\rangle$, they have to satisfy (14) for all γ . Then, according to the notation of Proposition 3,

$$\sigma_1 = \sum_j c_{1j}^2 |\phi_{1j}^{13}\rangle\langle\phi_{1j}^{13}| \upharpoonright_{M_1 \otimes M_3} \quad (17)$$

$$\sigma_2 = U_\ell \sigma_1 U_\ell^\dagger, \quad \sigma_{ov}(\gamma) = \gamma U_\ell \sigma_1 + \gamma^* \sigma_1 U_\ell^\dagger. \quad (18)$$

Taking $\gamma = 1$, it follows that $\hat{\sigma}(1) = \frac{P_\ell \sigma_1 P_\ell}{\text{Tr}(P_\ell \sigma_1)}$ and $\sigma_{ov}(1) = 2\sigma_1 - (1 - i)P_\ell \sigma_1 - (1 + i)\sigma_1 P_\ell$. Inequality (14) thus becomes

$$-2\text{Tr}(P_\ell \sigma_1 \log \sigma_1) \leq \text{Tr}(P_\ell \sigma_1) S(\hat{\sigma}(1)). \quad (19)$$

We develop $|\phi_{1j}^{13}\rangle = \sum_p \beta_{pj}^1 |\chi_p^1\rangle \otimes |\chi_\ell^3\rangle$, along an orthonormal basis for the factor M_1 , then, by means of the spectral decomposition (17), setting $\Delta_{j\ell} := \langle\phi_{1j}^{13}|P_\ell|\phi_{1j}^{13}\rangle = \sum_p |\beta_{pj}^1|^2$, we get $P_\ell \sigma_1 P_\ell = \left(\sum_j c_{1j}^2 \Delta_{j\ell} Q_{j\ell}\right) \otimes P_\ell$, where

$$Q_{j\ell} := |\hat{\chi}_{j\ell}^1\rangle\langle\hat{\chi}_{j\ell}^1| \text{ and } |\hat{\chi}_{j\ell}^1\rangle = \sum_p \frac{\beta_{pj}^1}{\Delta_{j\ell}} |\chi_p^1\rangle.$$

Insertion in (19) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \sum_j c_{1j}^2 \Delta_{j\ell} \log \frac{\Delta_{j\ell}}{c_{1j}^2 \text{Tr}(P_\ell \sigma)} \\ &\geq \sum_j c_{1j}^2 \left(\Delta_{j\ell} - c_{1j}^2 \text{Tr}(P_\ell \sigma) \right), \end{aligned}$$

the latter inequality coming from $x \log x/y \geq x - y$ and holding for all orthogonal projectors P_ℓ . Since $\sum_j c_{1j}^2 = 1$ and $\sum_\ell \Delta_{j\ell} = 1$, summing over ℓ we get that $c_{1j} = 1$ for one j and $c_{1k} = 0$ if $k \neq j$. Thus, the supposed optimal vectors $|\psi_i\rangle$ must be of the form $|\psi_i\rangle = |\phi_i^{13}\rangle \otimes |\phi_i^{24}\rangle$ and the supposed optimal decomposition (16) must reduce to

$$\rho \otimes \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_4 = \sum_i \alpha_i |\phi_i^{13}\rangle\langle\phi_i^{13}| \otimes |\phi_i^{24}\rangle\langle\phi_i^{24}|. \quad (20)$$

Tracing over $M_2 \otimes M_4$ with respect to the Schmidt decompositions $|\phi_i^{13}\rangle = \sum_j \delta_{ij}^{13} |\phi_{ij}^1\rangle \otimes |\phi_{ij}^3\rangle$ and $|\phi_i^{24}\rangle = \sum_j \delta_{ij}^{24} |\phi_{ij}^2\rangle \otimes |\phi_{ij}^4\rangle$, orthogonality yields

$$\rho = \sum_i \alpha_i \sum_{j\ell} (\delta_{ij}^{13})^2 (\delta_{i\ell}^{24})^2 |\phi_{ij}^1\rangle\langle\phi_{ij}^1| \otimes |\phi_{i\ell}^2\rangle\langle\phi_{i\ell}^2|. \quad (21)$$

We thus conclude that a decomposition of $\rho \otimes \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_4$ as in (16) can be optimal with respect to $M_1 \otimes M_3$ only if ρ is not entangled over $M_1 \otimes M_2$, in which case

$E_f(\rho \otimes \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_4; M_1 \otimes M_3) = 0$ is obviously additive. If ρ is entangled over $M_1 \otimes M_2$, the contradiction is avoided only if the optimal decompositions have the form

$$\rho \otimes \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_4 = \sum_i \alpha_i |\phi_i^{12}\rangle\langle\phi_i^{12}| \otimes |\phi_i^{34}\rangle\langle\phi_i^{34}|. \quad (22)$$

Thus, the optimal states cannot carry any entanglement over $M_1 \otimes M_3$ and additivity follows.

The second case we want to discuss is somewhat the opposite of the previous one where we proved that optimal projections for the tensor products are products of optimal projectors for the factors. In the second case, we want to show that putting together couples of optimal projectors for the factors we get optimal decompositions.

Case 2: we consider the state

$$\rho_\lambda = \lambda \rho + (1 - \lambda) \hat{\rho} \quad (23)$$

on $M_1 \otimes M_2 \otimes M_3 \otimes M_4$, where $\rho := |\phi^{12}\rangle\langle\phi^{12}| \otimes |\phi^{34}\rangle\langle\phi^{34}|$ and $\hat{\rho} := |\hat{\phi}^{12}\rangle\langle\hat{\phi}^{12}| \otimes |\hat{\phi}^{34}\rangle\langle\hat{\phi}^{34}|$.

Let $|\phi^{12}\rangle$ and $|\hat{\phi}^{12}\rangle$ be optimal vectors for some state ρ on $M_1 \otimes M_2$ relative to M_1 and $|\phi^{34}\rangle = |\phi^3\rangle \otimes |\phi^4\rangle$, $|\hat{\phi}^{34}\rangle = |\hat{\phi}^3\rangle \otimes |\hat{\phi}^4\rangle$ on $M_3 \otimes M_4$ so that $E(\rho_\lambda; M_3) = 0$.

The contribution to $E(\rho_\lambda; M_1 \otimes M_3)$ of the decomposition (23) is thus

$$E_\lambda := \lambda S(|\phi^{12}\rangle\langle\phi^{12}| \upharpoonright_{M_1}) + (1 - \lambda) S(|\hat{\phi}^{12}\rangle\langle\hat{\phi}^{12}| \upharpoonright_{M_1}) \quad (24)$$

and we want to prove that this is the best we can have.

We proceed as follows: as for (15), a general decomposition of ρ_λ is of the form $\rho_\lambda = \sum_i \alpha_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ where $|\psi_i\rangle = |\phi^{12} \otimes \phi^{34}\rangle + \gamma_i |\hat{\phi}^{12} \otimes \hat{\phi}^{34}\rangle$, with $\alpha_i > 0$ and

$$\sum_i \alpha_i = \lambda, \quad \sum_i \alpha_i |\gamma_i|^2 = 1 - \lambda, \quad \sum_i \alpha_i \gamma_i = 0. \quad (25)$$

We now set $b := \langle\phi^4|\hat{\phi}^4\rangle$, $a := \sqrt{1 - |b|^2}$ and construct the normalized vector state $|\psi^4\rangle := \frac{|\hat{\phi}^4\rangle - b|\phi^4\rangle}{a}$ such that $\langle\psi^4|\phi^4\rangle = 0$. We can thus rewrite

$$|\psi_i\rangle = a_i |\phi_i^{123} \otimes \phi^4\rangle + a \gamma_i |\hat{\phi}^{12} \otimes \hat{\phi}^3 \otimes \psi^4\rangle, \quad (26)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_i^{123}\rangle &:= \frac{|\phi^{12} \otimes \phi^3\rangle + b \gamma_i |\hat{\phi}^{12} \otimes \hat{\phi}^3 \otimes \phi^4\rangle}{a_i} \\ a_i^2 &:= 1 + |b|^2 |\gamma_i|^2 + 2 \text{Re}(b \gamma_i \langle\hat{\phi}^{12}|\phi^{12}\rangle \langle\hat{\phi}^3|\phi^3\rangle). \end{aligned}$$

With $|\hat{\psi}_i\rangle := \frac{|\psi_i\rangle}{\sqrt{\delta_i}}$, $\delta_i := a_i^2 + a^2 |\gamma_i|^2$, the decomposition (23) reads $\rho_\lambda = \sum_i \alpha_i \delta_i |\hat{\psi}_i\rangle\langle\hat{\psi}_i|$.

The contribution of the latter to the entanglement of formation $E_f(\rho_\lambda; M_1 \otimes M_3)$ is

$$E := \sum_i \alpha_i \delta_i S\left(|\hat{\psi}_i\rangle\langle\hat{\psi}_i| \upharpoonright_{M_1 \otimes M_3}\right). \quad (27)$$

From the orthogonality of ψ^4 and ϕ^4 it follows that

$$|\hat{\psi}_i\rangle\langle\hat{\psi}_i| \upharpoonright_{M_1 \otimes M_3} = \frac{a_i^2}{\delta_i} \sigma_i^{123} + \frac{a^2 |\gamma_i|^2}{\delta_i} \sigma^{123},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i^{123} &:= |\phi_i^{123}\rangle\langle\phi_i^{123}| \upharpoonright_{M_1 \otimes M_3} \\ \sigma^{123} &:= |\hat{\phi}^{12}\rangle\langle\hat{\phi}^{12}| \upharpoonright_{M_1} \otimes |\hat{\phi}^3\rangle\langle\hat{\phi}^3| \upharpoonright_{M_3}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Concavity of the von Neumann entropy yields

$$E \geq \sum_i \alpha_i \left\{ a_i^2 S\left(\sigma_i^{123} \upharpoonright_{M_1 \otimes M_3}\right) + a^2 |\gamma_i|^2 S\left(|\hat{\phi}^{12}\rangle\langle\hat{\phi}^{12}| \upharpoonright_{M_1}\right) \right\}. \quad (29)$$

As done before, we construct the normalized vector $|\psi^3\rangle := \frac{|\hat{\phi}^3\rangle - d|\phi^3\rangle}{c}$, such that $\langle\psi^3|\phi^3\rangle = 0$ where $d := \langle\phi^3|\hat{\phi}^3\rangle$, $c := \sqrt{1 - |d|^2}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_i^{123}\rangle &:= \frac{b_i |\psi_i^{12} \otimes \phi^3\rangle + bc \gamma_i |\hat{\phi}^{12} \otimes \psi^3\rangle}{a_i} \\ |\psi_i^{12}\rangle &:= \frac{|\phi^{12}\rangle + bd \gamma_i |\hat{\phi}^{12}\rangle}{b_i} \\ b_i^2 &:= 1 + |b|^2 |d|^2 |\gamma_i|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re}(bd \gamma_i \langle\hat{\phi}^{12}|\phi^{12}\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Introducing the Schmidt decompositions over $M_1 \otimes M_2$: $|\psi_i^{12}\rangle = \sum_j c_{ij} |\phi_{ij}^1\rangle \otimes |\phi_{ij}^2\rangle$, $|\hat{\phi}^{12}\rangle = \sum_\ell d_\ell |\hat{\phi}_\ell^1\rangle \otimes |\hat{\phi}_\ell^2\rangle$, and setting $\rho_1 := |\psi_i^{12}\rangle\langle\psi_i^{12}| \upharpoonright_{M_1}$, $\rho_2 := |\hat{\phi}^{12}\rangle\langle\hat{\phi}^{12}| \upharpoonright_{M_1}$, because of the orthogonality of ϕ^3 and ψ^3 , the state σ_i^{123} in (28) restricted to $M_1 \otimes M_3$ can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i^{123} &= \frac{1}{a_i^2} \begin{pmatrix} b_i^2 \rho_1 & cb_i b^* \gamma_i^* \sqrt{\rho_1} V \sqrt{\rho_2} \\ cb_i b \gamma_i \sqrt{\rho_2} V^\dagger \sqrt{\rho_1} & |b|^2 c^2 |\gamma_i|^2 \rho_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{a_i^2} \begin{pmatrix} b_i \sqrt{\rho_1} V & 0 \\ cb_i \gamma_i \sqrt{\rho_2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b_i V^\dagger \sqrt{\rho_1} & cb^* \gamma_i^* \sqrt{\rho_2} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where $V := \sum_{j,\ell} \langle\hat{\phi}_\ell^2|\phi_{ij}^{12}\rangle |\phi_{ij}^1\rangle\langle\hat{\phi}_\ell^1|$ is a unitary operator and $\sqrt{\rho_1} V \sqrt{\rho_2} = |\psi_i^{12}\rangle\langle\hat{\phi}^{12}| \upharpoonright_{M_1}$.

Since $\sigma_i^{123} = A^\dagger A$ has the same entropy as $AA^\dagger = \frac{1}{a_i^2} \begin{pmatrix} b_i^2 V^\dagger \rho_1 V + |b|^2 c^2 |\gamma_i|^2 \rho_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, concavity and invariance under unitary transformations of the von Neumann entropy yield

$$S(\sigma_i^{123}) = S(AA^\dagger) \geq \frac{b_i^2}{a_i^2} S(\rho_1) + \frac{c^2 |b|^2 |\gamma_i|^2}{a_i^2} S(\rho_2),$$

whence (29) becomes

$$E \geq \sum_i \alpha_i \left\{ b_i^2 S(\rho_1) + |\gamma_i|^2 (a^2 + c^2 |b|^2) S(\rho_2) \right\}. \quad (31)$$

Since we assumed the states $|\phi^{12}\rangle$ and $|\hat{\phi}^{12}\rangle$ in (30) to be optimal for some state on $M_1 \otimes M_2$ when restricted to M_1 , we can use the necessary condition (14). According to the notation of Proposition 3, we have $\sigma_1 = \rho_2$, $\sigma_2 = |\phi^{12}\rangle\langle\phi^{12}| \upharpoonright_{M_1}$, $\gamma = \gamma_i^* b^* d^*$, $\hat{\sigma}(\gamma) = \rho_1$ and

$$\sigma_{ov}(\gamma) = -b^* d^* \gamma_i^* \sqrt{\rho_2} V^\dagger \sqrt{\rho_1} - bd \gamma_i \sqrt{\rho_1} V \sqrt{\rho_2}.$$

From (14) and the conditions (25) it follows that

$$E \geq \sum_i \alpha_i \left\{ S(|\phi^{12}\rangle\langle\phi^{12}| \upharpoonright_{M_1}) + |\gamma_i|^2 S(|\hat{\phi}^{12}\rangle\langle\hat{\phi}^{12}| \upharpoonright_{M_1}) - \operatorname{Tr}(\sigma_{ov}(b^* d^* \gamma_i^*) \log \rho_2) \right\} = E_\lambda, \quad (32)$$

where E_λ is the contribution (24) to the entanglement of formation $E(\rho_\lambda; M_1 \otimes M_3)$ of the decomposition (23), which turns out then to be already optimal.

In this letter we have derived a necessary and sufficient condition for the optimality of two vector states and showed its usefulness by proving additivity in two cases. While in case 1. additivity was rather expected because of the tensor-product state $\rho \otimes \sigma$, it was less so in case 2. We requested, however, additional properties on the state structure over $M_3 \otimes M_4$: in case 1. factorization of $\sigma = \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_4$ and in case 2. factorization into pure states of the optimal decomposers. In both cases the state was thus separable with respect to $M_3 \otimes M_4$.

-
- [1] C.H. Bennet, D.P. DiVincenzo, J.A. Smolin, and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996)
 - [2] S. Hill, and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 5022 (1997)
 - [3] W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998)
 - [4] V. Vedral, and M.B. Plenio, Pys. Rev. A **57**, 1619 (1998)
 - [5] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, lanl e-print quant-ph/9908065
 - [6] G.G. Amosov, A.S. Holevo, and R.F. Werner, lanl e-print math-ph/0003002
 - [7] A. S. Holevo, Prob. Inf. Transmission USSR **9** 31 (1993)
 - [8] F. Benatti, J. Math. Phys. **37** 5244 (1996)
 - [9] A. Connes, H. Narnhofer, and W. Thirring, Comm. Math. Phys. **112**, 691 (1987); H. Narnhofer, and W. Thirring: Fizika **17**, 257 (1985)
 - [10] A. Peres, and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 1119 (1991)
 - [11] N. Gisin and S. Popescu, lanl e-print quant-ph/9901072
 - [12] F. Benatti, H. Narnhofer, and A. Uhlmann, Rep. Math. Phys. **38**, 123 (1996)
 - [13] F. Benatti, H. Narnhofer, and A. Uhlmann, Lett. Math. Phys. **47**, 237 (1999)